

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 20-23 are now pending in this application, claims 12-19 having been canceled herein and claims 20-23 having been added herein. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the impact of the cabling changes on service *includes impacts on cross-connects and lightpaths*. Support for this limitation is provided on pages 6 and 7 of Applicants' specification. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite the step of *displaying the impact of the cable changes on the service including the impacts on cross-connects and lightpaths*. Support for this limitation is provided in FIGs. 5 and 6 and the accompanying text of Applicants' specification.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to as being blurry and hard to read. Replacement drawings are filed herewith, obviating this rejection. Any changes made to the drawings were made only to comply with the physical requirements of 37 CFR 1.84, i.e. line quality and uniformity, margins, scale, shading, etc.; no new matter is added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection of claims 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is made moot by the cancellation of claims 12-19 above.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 12-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by Doshi et al. (US 6,130,875, "Doshi"). Claims 7-11, 14 and 19 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Henderson et al. (US 6,058,103, "Henderson"). These rejections as they apply to the pending claims are hereby traversed for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the impact of the cabling changes on service *includes impacts on cross-connects and lightpaths*. In the rejection of dependent claim 9 and 10, the Examiner apparently recognizes that Doshi does not

display cross-connects and lightpaths. The Examiner asserts, however, that these features are shown in Henderson. In particular, the Examiner asserts on page 7 of the Office Action that Henderson teaches at column 16, lines 10-26 that a GUI displays lightpaths impacted by a cabling change. Applicants' respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Henderson merely states that the affected regions of the network are automatically displayed to a network engineer. Henderson makes no reference to any impacts on lightpaths. In fact, Henderson does not even specifically discuss lightpaths. Accordingly, since claim 1 as amended requires determining the impact of cabling changes on cross-connects and lightpaths and because neither Doshi, Henderson nor any of the remaining references cited by the Examiner show or suggest such a feature, claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims set forth features that are patentable for reasons separate and independent from those presented above in connection with claim 1. In particular, claim 11 sets forth that any cabling change must be approved by an operator before initiation of the change. The Examiner asserts that this feature is shown at column 26, lines 12-18 of Henderson. This portion of Henderson, which is included in a discussion of the manner in which a workstation creates a synchronization plan for a network using a network simulation, reads as follows:

The process then continues in step 1020. In step 1020, the process determines whether the simulation results from steps 1016 and 1018 indicate an adequate synchronization topology. If the simulation results are deemed to meet robustness criteria, then the process completes in step 1024. In step 1024, the synchronization plan is released for use as being a viable design.

Applicants fail to see any reference in this passage to a requirement that operator approval be obtained before initiating a change. Rather, these steps all appear to refer to an automated process that is performed on a workstation without intervention of a network designer that initiates the simulation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Henderson fails to show or suggest the limitation set forth in claim 11.

Newly added claim 20 sets forth that the impact determining step includes determining if lightpaths have been automatically rerouted off affected optical links.

Newly added claim 21 sets forth the step of detecting changes in lambda-level connectivity between the optical nodes. In addition, newly added claim 22 sets forth that the detected changes in lambda-level connectivity are detected using unique data patterns that are communicated between adjacent ones of the optical nodes. Finally, newly added claim 23 sets forth that the unique data patterns are communicated over each non-cross-connected lambda. Support for these limitations is found on pages 11 and 12 of Applicants' specification. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the limitations recited in claims 20-23 are shown or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-23 are patentable for reasons separate and independent from those presented above in connection with claim 1.

Accordingly, for all of the reasons presented above the rejection of independent claim and the claims that depend therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and/or 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes there are still unresolved issues, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcomed.

FEES

Any fees that may be due and owing as a result of this Amendment may be charged to the undersigned attorney's PTO Deposit Account No. 50-1047.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/16/2009

Attorney for Applicants
Mayer & Williams PC
251 North Avenue West, 2nd Floor
Westfield, NJ 07090
908-518-7700 Tel.
908-518-7795 Fax

Respectfully submitted,

By /Stuart H. Mayer/

Stuart H. Mayer
Registration No.: 35,277